DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 163 CE 066 961

AUTHOR Safrit, R. Dale; And Others
TITLE Utilizing an Innovative Evaluation Model To Assess Impacts of Training Adult Educators on Reaching Limited Resource Audiences.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the International Conference on the Practice of Adult Education and Social Development (Jinan, China, April 13-18, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Economically Disadvantaged; *Evaluation Methods; Models; *Staff Development; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Improvement; Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT

An interagency conference, Reading Families and Youth Who Have Limited Resources, was held in September 1992. Over a 2-day period, 186 adult educators and human service professionals participated in 27 different workshops. An innovative evaluation model was developed to assess the impacts of conference participation on reaching audiences who have limited resources. Pre- and post-assessments were administered to evaluate adult educators' knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations in working with limited resource audiences and to collect basic participant demographic data. A longitudinal follow-up evaluation was conducted to evaluate these same concepts 12 months after the conference. Findings indicated that adult educators increased their knowledge about limited resource audiences and how to work effectively with them. Attitudes and skills of professionals in working with limited resource audiences were measured. Qualitative data also identified successes and challenges when teaching limited resource individuals. Successes were reported in nutrition-related and money management educational programs and programs for urban youth. A number of challenges were identified: recruitment and maintenance of small groups, teaching in mandated programs, interacting with families/individuals in crisis, timing of programs, lack of client commitment, fear of group pressure, and inability to evaluate programs effectively. (Instruments are appended.) (Author/YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

UTILIZING AN INNOVATIVE EVALUATION MODEL TO ASSESS IMPACTS OF TRAINING ADULT EDUCATORS ON REACHING LIMITED RESOURCE AUDIENCES

ED 373 163

R. Dale Safrit, Ed.D.
Extension Specialist, Volunteerism,
Ohio State University Extension,
Assistant Professor, Agricultural Education,
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, OH 43210
Tel. (614) 292-9696
FAX (614) 292-1240

Marilyn R. Spiegel, Ph.D.
Assistant Director, Home Economics & Associate Dean, College of Human Ecology
Associate Professor, Ohio State University Extension
135 Campbell Hall
1787 Neil Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210
Tel. (614) 292-4481
FAX (614) 292-7536

Ann Miller, M.S.
District Specialist, Home Economics, and
Assistant Professor,
Ohio State University Extension
303 Corporate Center Drive
Vandalia, OH 45377
Tel. (513) 454-5002
FAX (513) 454-1237

Mary Kershaw, M.S.
Extension Agent, Expanded Foods and Nutrition Education Program,
Ohio State University Extension
1945 Frebis Avenue
Columbus, OH 45377
Tel. (614) 443-6200
FAX (614) 443-5031

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R D Safrit

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE 068 561

UTILIZING AN INNOVATIVE EVALUATION MODEL TO ASSESS IMPACTS OF TRAINING ADULT EDUCATORS ON REACHING LIMITED RESOURCE AUDIENCES

Abstract

An interagency Reaching Families and Youth Who Have Limited Resources Conference was held in September, 1992. One-hundred eighty-six adult educators and human service professionals participated in 27 different workshops over a two day period. The authors developed an innovative evaluation model to assess impacts of training conference participants on reaching limited resource audiences. Pre- and Post-Assessments were administered to evaluate adult educators' knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations in working with limited resource audiences and to collect basic participant demographic data. A longitudinal Follow-Up Evaluation was conducted to evaluate these same concepts twelve months following the Conference. Adult educators increased their knowledge about limited resource audiences and how to work effectively with them. Attitudes and skills of professionals in working with limited resource audiences were measured, and qualitative data identified both successes and challenges when teaching limited resource individuals.

Introduction

Adult education organizations are being challenged to anticipate and cope with an ever-changing society during the decade of the 90's and beyond. These societal changes affect the economic, physical, and emotional well-being of families, neighborhoods, and entire communities. The consequences of these changes present new obstacles and opportunities for traditional public policy, including formal and non-formal adult education and social service systems that address the needs of families and communities.

Limited resource audiences include those families and youth with limited income and/or education who are struggling to maintain supportive environments (Limited Resource Audiences Committee, 1991). Limited resource audiences include the working poor; families eligible for or receiving public assistance; single parents; teenagers; and the functionally illiterate. These groups face multiple problems in their day-to-day existence including unemployment or underemployment, hunger, homelessness, limited health care, teen pregnancies, affordable daycare, and higher than average rates of infant mortality, child abuse and neglect, substance abuse, and AIDS.

The disparity between the richest and poorest in the United States is growing. Based on United States Census Bureau information and a survey of 60,000 households, the Ohio Department of Human Services (1990) reports that the income gap between the rich and the poor, and the rich and the middle class, continues to widen. In 1989, the top 20% of American households earned 47% of the nation's income, a 3% decrease since 1979. The bottom 20% of households earned 4% of the nation's income, a slight decrease since 1979. The middle 60% of American households earned 49% of the nation's income, a 3% decrease since 1979. These data indicate that we are no longer a society comprised of only upper, middle and lower classes; rather, American society has formed two distinctive

subclasses of the traditional middle class, an upper middle class and a lower middle class. Currently, 90% of all jobs are in the service sector, resulting in an increased number of lower middle class families and youth. In Ohio, statistics indicate that average service sector wages are 40% lower than those in the manufacturing sector ($349 per week compared to $580 per week).

Although their backgrounds and needs vary greatly, limited resource audiences are also at a distinct educational disadvantage. Most employers view postsecondary degrees, diplomas, certificates, and educational attainment as proxies for the ability to perform work at above-average skill levels (The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship, 1988). A high school diploma, long considered the single most powerful predictor of success in the labor market, is now the minimum requirement for entry into today's work force. High school dropouts are unlikely to be considered for employment opportunities that pay much ab minimum wage.

Strengthening families and communities, and helping youth develop life skills, have long been goals of Ohio State University Extension (O.S.U. Extension), an adult education. During the present four-year educational program planning cycle, O.S.U. Extension is placing a major focus on individual, family, and community development including issues that address strengthening relationships; developing basic life skills; effective resource management; and improved nutrition, diet, health and safety. Adult educators (professionals and paraprofessionals) and volunteer Extension staff in each of the eighty-eight counties are initiating efforts, often in direct cooperation with other educational and social service agencies and organizations, to develop non-formal educational programs that address these issues for all Ohioans, including those with limited resources.

Background of the Study

Professional, paraprofessional, and volunteer staff of adult educational and social service agencies and organizations need to increase their knowledge, attitudes and skills in addressing the needs of limited resource audiences. Programs for these audiences need to take a comprehensive and culturally appropriate approach to subject matter (Limited Resource Audience Committee, 1991). Sensitivity to limited resource audiences when selecting the method of delivering programs is of paramount importance. Furthermore, opportunities should be provided for face-to-face interaction among personnel and the sharing of ideas and resources among adult educational and social service organizations and agencies that work with limited resource audiences. According to the recommendations of the Extension Service - U.S.D.A.'s Limited Resource Audiences Committee (1991), a major goal for such organizations and agencies should be to...

> design, promote, and implement staff training that addresses the attitudes, skills, and knowledge needed to work effectively with limited resource audiences. (p. 5)

O.S.U. Extension co-sponsored a "State of Limited Resource Families and Youth" Conference in September, 1992, in Columbus, Ohio. Appropriate Ohio State University colleges and

departments, Ohio state government agencies and other adult education organizations were invited to co-sponsor, contribute and participate in the Conference. Leadership for the Conference was provided by the authors and a steering committee consisting of selected state and district Extension faculty and representatives of other sponsoring agencies.

The overall goal for the Conference was to provide the opportunity for adult educators to develop knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations in addressing needs and issues of limited resource families and youth. The target audience for the Conference was professional, paraprofessional, and volunteer staff of Ohio adult education and social service agencies and organizations. The educational objectives for the Conference included:

(1) to provide for structured interactions between professional, paraprofessional, and volunteer adult educators and service providers in areas addressing current and emerging needs and issues facing limited resource families and youth;
(2) to create an educational environment for sharing successful programs that facilitate the development of limited resource families and youth; and
(3) to communicate current research and its implications and applications addressing limited resource families and youth.

The two-day Conference included 27 concurrent sessions addressing issues and needs of limited resource audiences facilitated by youth and adult education and human service professionals (Figure 1). One-hundred eighty-six individuals from three states participated in the Conference, 166 full-time and 20 part-time.

Methodology

The innovative evaluation model incorporated pre-Conference, immediate post-Conference, and longitudinal (12 months) post-Conference evaluation components into a holistic evaluation model (Figure 2). On the first day of the Conference, participants completed a 10 item Pre-Assessment instrument that (1) investigated their knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations in working with limited resource audiences, and (2) collected basic demographic data (see Appendix A).

The Post-Assessment instrument included 29 items to (1) evaluate participants' knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations in working with limited resource audiences as a result of their Conference experiences, and (2) collect basic demographic data (see Appendix B). Part I utilized three open-ended items and two closed-ended items to investigate participants' resulting knowledge of limited resource audiences. Part II included nine items utilizing a four point Likert-type scale to evaluate participants' attitudes regarding general aspects of the overall Conference. Part III included five items utilizing a four point Likert-type scale to assess participants' attitudes regarding the Conference workshops in which they participated. Part IV included two items utilizing a four point Likert-type scale to evaluate participants' impressions of the Conference keynote speakers. Part V included five close-ended items that collected basic demographic data regarding Conference participants, including level of operation, professional title, major program focus area, gender, and race/ethnicity.

Construct validity of both Assessment instruments was established by a panel of experts; face and content validity were established by piloting the Assessment instruments with professionals working with limited resource audiences who did not attend the Conference.

The longitudinal Follow-Up Evaluation instrument utilized 25 items to investigate Conference participants' knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations, resulting from their participation in the Conference, in working with limited resource audiences twelve months following the Conference (see Appendix C). Part I utilized six multiple choice items to investigate participants' knowledge of limited resource audiences. Part II involved three items utilizing a modified semantic differential (Osgood and Tannebaum, 1983) to investigate participants' attitudes toward limited resource audiences. Part III included nine items utilizing a four point Likert type scale to investigate participants' skills in working with limited resource audiences, while Part IV included two open-ended items that investigated participants' aspirations in working with limited resource audiences and two closed-ended items that investigated possible topics and potential delivery methods for future training on limited resource audiences. Part V included three items to collect basic demographic information about the respondent. Construct validity of The Follow-Up Evaluation instrument was established by a panel of experts; face and content validity were established by piloting the instrument with professionals working with limited resource audiences who did not attend the Conference.

Both the Pre-Assessment and Post-Assessment instruments were administered on site on the first and final days of the Conference, respectively. One-hundred forty-two participants completed the Pre-Assessment instrument, and 115 completed the Post-Assessment instrument, resulting in 74 clearly identified matched pairs of individual participant responses. This represents an 80.9% response rate, with a 52.1% completion rate. Data were coded and computer analyzed. Frequency tables and basic statistical information were calculated using SPSS+.

The Follow-Up Evaluations were numbered and mailed to participants along with a one-page cover letter in August, 1993. Respondents were asked to return completed evaluations by September, 1993. One-hundred six conference participants completed and returned the 12 month Follow-Up Evaluation, a 56.5% response rate. Seventeen participants were no longer working with youth or adult education or human services organizations, a research methodology mortality rate of 9%. Of the remaining 63 Conference participants, every fourth non-respondent was surveyed by telephone to control for non-response as suggested by Borg and Gall (1983) and Miller and Smith (1983). Data collected were coded and computer analyzed. Frequency tables and basic statistical information were calculated using SPSS+.

Additional components of the evaluation methodology are scheduled to be conducted in winter 1993 and spring 1994. These include focus group interviews with both homogenous Conference participant groups (e.g., O.S.U. Extension Expanded Foods and Nutrition Education Program educators) as well as heterogenous participant groups. The evaluations will be utilized in planning a follow-up satellite broadcast on working with limited resource families and youth in autumn, 1994 (Figure 2).

Findings

The 186 adult educators who participated in this conference represented 29 different agencies or organizations with 50 position titles. Three different states sent people to this conference. An overall conference evaluation summary is presented in Table 1. This table shows data from all pre-assessments (N=142), all post-assessments (N=115), pre/post matched pre-responses (N=74), and pre/post matched post-responses (N=74).

More than 90% of the respondents were from counties with the major groups being EFNEP personnel (33.8%), Extension agents (28.4%), and Human Services (27%). Ninety-six percent were female. The rank order of the program focus areas were: EFNEP, Home Economics, Social Work, and Youth Development. The racial/ethnic make-up of the group was primarily Caucasian (79.7%), followed by Black (13.5%), and Hispanic (2.7%).

Participants increased their feelings of being up-to-date on current research focused on limited resource audiences by 56.8% between the matched pre and post-assessments. Eighty-four percent indicated that their expectations of the conference had been met.

Table 2 displays the mean and standard deviations for various aspects of the overall conference evaluation that was given as part of the post-assessment. A Likert-type scale was used to assess these values with the following scale: 1=Terrible, 2=OK, 3=Good,

Table 1

REACHING FAMILIES AND YOUTH WHO HAVE LIMITED RESOURCES CONFERENCE EVALUATION SUMMARY

DEMOGRAPHICS:

Label	Pre (All) N=142 %	Post (All) N=115 %	Pre/Post (Matched) Pre. Resp. N=74 %	Pre/Post (Matched) Post Resp. N=74 %
Level				
County	85.9	81.7	91.9	90.5
District	3.5	3.5	1.4	1.4
State	7.7	4.3	5.4	4.1
Missing	2.8	10.4	1.4	4.1
Title				
Agent	23.9	24.3	28.4	28.4
EFNEP	33.8	38.3	33.8	33.8
Dist. Spec.	2.1	2.6	1.4	1.4
State Spec.	2.1	1.7	0.0	1.4
Admin.	2.1	1.7	1.4	2.7
Human Ser.	11.3	1.7	4.1	2.7
Other	21.8	21.7	28.4	27.0
Missing	2.8	7.8	2.7	2.7
Program Focus				
Home Ec.	29.6	27.0	32.4	31.1
Youth	12.7	12.2	9.5	9.5
EFNEP	32.4	38.3	37.8	37.8
Social Work	19.7	11.3	17.6	16.2
Other	3.5	2.6	1.4	1.4
Missing	2.1	8.7	1.4	4.1
Gender				
Male	8.5	2.6	4.1	1.4
Female	90.8	88.7	95.9	95.9
Missing	.7	8.7	0.0	2.7
Race/Ethnic Group				
Caucasian	71.1	60.9	79.7	79.7
Black	21.1	20.9	16.2	13.5
Native Am.	.7	.9	0.0	0.0
Hispanic	3.5	3.5	2.7	2.7
Asian	.7	2.6	0.0	0.0
Other	1.4	1.7	1.4	1.4
Missing	1.4	9.6	0.0	2.7
Do you feel you are up-to-date on the current research that targets families and youth who have limited resources?				
Yes	26.1	86.1	29.7	86.5
No	65.5	4.3	60.8	4.1
Missing	8.5	9.6	9.5	9.5

Table 2

POST-ASSESSMENT RESPONSES:

Were your expectations of this conference met?		
	Post: All	Post: Matched
Yes	82.6	83.8
No	8.7	6.8
Missing	8.7	9.5

OVERALL CONFERENCE:	Post: All		Post: Matched	
	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.
(Scale: 1 = Terrible, 2 = O.K., 3 = Good, and 4 + Outstanding)				
Format of Conference	3.11	.65	3.13	.63
Value of Conference to Your Work	3.15	.61	3.21	.54
Content/Subjects Covered	3.23	.61	3.30	.57
Usefulness of Information	3.20	.66	3.26	.67
Quality of Presenters	3.30	.57	3.37	.54
Pre-Conference Publicity	2.56	.71	2.58	.75
Registration Process	2.96	.75	3.00	.76
Cost of Conference	2.90	.72	2.97	.70
Opportunities for Networking	2.90	.80	2.93	.80
WORKSHOPS: Content/Subjects Covered	3.28	.59	3.36	.54
Organization of Workshops	3.27	.59	3.30	.59
Application of Current Issues	3.23	.69	3.26	.69
Usefulness of Information	3.21	.67	3.22	.68
Quality of Presenters	3.26	.60	3.31	.58
SPEAKERS: Ray Miller	3.61	.65	3.63	.61
Cheryl Boyce	3.75	.49	3.74	.48

and 4=Outstanding. The rank order of these means are: quality of presenters, content/subjects covered, usefulness of information, value of conference to your work, format of conference, registration process, cost of conference, and opportunities for networking. Under workshops the rank order was content/subjects covered, quality of presenters, organization of workshops, application of current issues, usefulness of information. Both the keynote and capnote speakers received high mean scores.

The follow-up evaluation was a mailed survey that was sent to all conference participants. One-hundred six evaluations were returned which measured knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations of respondents. At the knowledge level the questions were asked and people had a number of responses from which to choose. The most common characteristics of limited resource families and the percent of respondents who identified it correctly are listed in parentheses. The correct characteristics were inability to obtain adequate health care (74.5%), substandard housing (66%), limited educational opportunities(50%), receive public assistance (49.1%), and inadequate income despite employment (73.6%). Many respondents also identified low self-esteem and poor nutrition as common characteristics which are not the most common characteristics of limited resource audiences.

Issues that continue to face Ohio's limited resource families and youth are high level of illiteracy (54.7%), increased exposure to crime/violence (76.4%), inadequate housing options (70.8%), and limited transportation options (67.9%). Emerging issues facing Ohio's limited resource families and youth are high risk of HIV infection (61.3%), increased numbers of entry-level production jobs, high risk of contracting tuberculosis (20.8%), and increased number of homeless families and youth (84%).

When asked to identify agencies/organizations who conduct educational programs and/or provide human services primarily for limited resource families and youth, the respondents marked the correct responses: Department of Human Services (85.8%), the Salvation Army (70.8%), food banks/pantries (84.9%), and Habitat for Humanity (67%). More than half also marked health departments who do not primarily serve limited resource audiences. Programs targeted primarily for limited resource families and youth included: Women, Infants, and Children (93.4%); Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (84.9%); Head Start (88.7%); Displaced Homemakers (37.7%); and Food Stamp Program (87.7%).

Attitudes were measured using a semantic differential scale of bi-polar adjectives. The mean and standard deviation was calculated on each set. Table 3 provides this information. The respondents felt limited resource families and youth were good and found them to be friendly. When working with limited resource audiences, the respondents felt it was right, purposeful, useful, and they were comfortable in doing it. The collaboration with other agencies/organizations was positive, effective, and requires much time. Maintaining identity can also be a problem.

The respondents indicated their skill level in working with limited resource audiences (Table 4). The rank order of these levels were: collaborating/working together, identifying potential audiences, assessing needs of clientele, working with diverse populations, building support networks, designing relevant programs, utilizing evaluation results to improve program,

implementing relevant programs, evaluating impact of programs.

Aspirations were measured through a qualitative means of asking open-ended questions and then using Ethnograph to analyze data. First they were asked to describe programs/activities/ideas that have been successful as a result of attending this conference. Secondly, they were asked to describe programs/activities/ideas that have not worked well. Nineteen respondents reported that nutrition-related and money management educational programs which they conducted had been most beneficial to participants. Issues addressed included food shopping, use of food stamps, food preparation, basic nutrition, and budgeting. Several of these lessons were taught by paraprofessionals employed in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program.

Programs for urban youth were highly rated by eleven participants. Summer enrichment programs, programs in school settings, and special activities for at-risk youth were conducted. One participant commented that "community programs which focus on personal involvement were most successful....it gives youth a sense of pride, accomplishment, and worthwhileness".

Incidences of opportunity to collaborate with other agencies were solicited and utilized. Participants shared resources with social service agencies, worked with local homeless shelters, senior centers, battered women's shelters, metro housing units, schools and court systems. Working relationships were established with WIC programs (pregnant/nursing mothers and babies), JOBS programs, GRADS programs (teen parents) and ABLE programs (basic literacy).

Instructions was also offered on parenting, child care, home safety, urban gardening, home-based services, and home maintenance. In some counties, volunteer teachers were trained to extend the information to new audiences. Client diversity was achieved by many participants. Varied racial, ethnic, and socio-economic backgrounds were reported by over fifty percent of the respondents.

Efforts were also conducted which were less successful. Limitations of time, low literacy skills of clientele, transportation to programs, child care, financial resources, and short-term programming efforts impacted effectiveness. Development of a trust or relationship between teacher and client was reported as essential to learning. Participants stated the need to adapt traditional teaching materials for limited resource audiences--frequently a time intensive process.

The recruitment and maintenance of small groups of limited resource clientele were indicated as challenges by several participants.

Table 3

ATTITUDES OF PARTICIPANTS WORKING WITH LIMITED RESOURCE AUDIENCES
(4 POINT SCALE)

	MEAN	S.D.
Limited resource families and youth are...		
Good/Bad	3.37	.60
Unfriendly/Friendly	3.12	.71
New/Old	2.78	.84
Sharp/Dull	2.66	.63
Dirty/Clean	2.76	.62
Working with limited resource audiences is...		
Comfortable/Uncomfortable	3.20	.79
Difficult/Easy	2.24	.90
Useless/Useful	3.53	.64
Purposeful/Purposeless	3.67	.65
Right/Wrong	3.79	.44
Collaborating with other agencies/organizations regarding limited resourcing families and youth...		
Is Easy/Is Hard	2.63	.89
Maintains Identity/Loses Identity	3.04	.78
Is Effective/Is Not Effective	3.43	.62
Is Negative/Is Positive	3.54	.64
Requires Much Time/Requires Little Time	3.29	.70

Table 4

SKILL LEVEL IN WORKING WITH LIMITED RESOURCE AUDIENCES
SCALE: 1 = No Skills, 2 = Few Skills, 3 = Some Skills, 4 = Many Skills

SKILL:	MEAN	S.D.
Building Support Networks	3.15	.66
Collaborating/Working Together	3.41	.58
Identifying Potential Audiences	3.26	.67
Assessing Needs of Clientele	3.21	.71
Designing Relevant Programs	3.15	.72
Implementing Relevant Programs	3.09	.76
Evaluating Impact of Programs	2.89	.78
Working with Diverse Populations	3.21	.80
Utilizing Evaluation Results to Improve Programs	3.12	.72

Concerns related to teaching in mandated programs, interacting with families/individuals in crisis, the timing of programs ("not on food stamp or welfare check day"), lack of client commitment, fear of group pressure and inability to effectively evaluate programs were reported. While collaborating with other agencies was expressed as a strength in reaching clientele, it was also viewed as an obstacle by others. Breaking into existing collaborations and/or fostering a cooperative work atmosphere was sometimes difficult.

The participants were asked to identify topics on which they would like additional training or information. The rank order of their responses are:

- Developing resource materials for limited resource audiences.
- Strategies for working with limited resource families and youth.
- Developing an inter-agency network for sharing ideas and resources.
- Developing volunteer leadership for limited resource audiences.
- Transitioning these audiences into existing extension programs.
- Health care issues.
- Emerging issues.
- Working with diverse groups.
- Issues pertaining to homelessness.

To receive additional training, the respondents most preferred a face-to-face conference/in-service. Their second choice was a combination of face-to-face/satellite conference/in-service. The remainder of the training methods were printed materials, interactive satellite conference/in-service, video tapes, and audio tapes.

The respondents were primarily from Extension (78.3%), followed by Human Services (6.6%), Social Services (4.7%), Health Services (1.9%), Churches (0.9%), and other (5.7%).

Discussion and Implications

The overall objectives of the conference were met. These included:

(1) provide for structured interactions between professional, paraprofessional, and volunteer adult educators and service providers in areas addressing current and emerging needs and issues facing families and youth who have limited resources;

(2) create an educational environment for sharing successful programs that facilitate the development of families and youth who have limited resources; and

(3) highlight current research and programs and their implications and applications addressing families and youth who have limited resources.

Implications for future programming and needs of the conference participants focus on the following items:

1. Utilizing mixed methods evaluations result in more valid and reliable data.

2. Adult educators participating in a specialized conference can dramatically increase their feelings of being updated on current research.

3. Collaborating and involving adult education agencies/organizations external to the university is a powerful method of building effective partnerships.

4. Additional training needs and methods of delivery need to be sought from the program participants, not determined by a committee.

5. Overall, working with limited resource audiences can be a challenge, but the benefits certainly support the efforts.

Selected References

Borg, W.R., & Gall, M.D. (1983). *Educational research: An introduction (Fourth edition).* New York: Longman.

Limited Resource Audiences Committee. (1991). *Reaching limited resource audiences: Recommendations for Extension action in the 1990's.* Washington, D.C.: Extension Service - United States Department of Agriculture.

Miller, L.E., & Smith, K.L. (1983). Handling nonresponse issues. *Journal of Extension* (Sept./Oct.), 45-50.

Ohio Department of Human Services. (1990). *Statistics at a glance.* Columbus: Office of Public Information.

The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship. (1988). *The forgotten half: Pathways to success for America's youth and young families.* Washington, D.C.: William T. Grant Foundation.

Appendix A

REACHING FAMILIES AND YOUTH WHO HAVE LIMITED RESOURCES
PRE-ASSESSMENT

PART I: Briefly answer the following questions:

1. Define the term "limited resource audiences."
2. Identify 3 current issues facing families and youth who have limited resources.
3. Identify 3 emerging issues facing families and youth who have limited resources.
4. List 3 expectations you have of this conference.
5. Do you feel you are up-to-date on the current research that targets families and youth who have limited resources?

_____ YES _____ NO

If YES, how have you kept up-to-date? _____

PART II: Check the appropriate responses:

6. At what level do you work:

___ COUNTY ___ DISTRICT ___ STATE

7. Your title is:

___ AGENT ___ EFNEP NUTRITION EDUCATOR ___ DISTRICT SPECIALIST

___ STATE SPECIALIST ___ ADMINISTRATOR ___ HUMAN SERVICES

___ OTHER (LIST)_____

8. Your major area of program focus is:

___ HOME ECONOMICS ___ 4-H/YOUTH DEVELOPMENT ___ EFNEP

___ AGRICULTURE ___ CNRD (COMMUNITY AND NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT)

___ SOCIAL WORK ___ OTHER (LIST) _____

9. Your gender is:

___ MALE ___ FEMALE

10. Your race/ethnic group is:

___ CAUCASIAN ___ BLACK/AFRICAN-AMERICAN ___ NATIVE AMERICAN

___ HISPANIC ___ ASIAN/PACIFIC-ISLANDER ___ OTHER

Appendix B

REACHING FAMILIES AND YOUTH WHO HAVE LIMITED RESOURCES
POST-ASSESSMENT

PART I: Briefly answer the following questions:

1. Define the term "limited resource audiences."
2. Identify 3 current issues facing families and youth who have limited resources.
3. Identify 3 emerging issues facing families and you who have limited resources.
4. Were your expectations of this conference met?

   ___ YES ___ NO
5. If you answered "NO" to number 4, what would you suggest to improve future conferences on this topic.
6. Do you feel you have been updated on the current research that targets families and youth who have limited resources?

   ___ YES ___ NO
7. What do you plan to do as a result of attending this conference?
8. What else would you like us to hear about this conference?

PART II: How would your rate the following general aspects of Reaching Families and Youth Who Have Limited Resource Conference? (Circle your response.)

		TERRIBLE	O.K.	GOOD	OUTSTANDING
9.	Format of the Conference	1	2	3	4
10.	Value of Conference to Your Professional Work	1	2	3	4
11.	Contents/Subjects Covered	1	2	3	4
12.	Usefulness of Information	1	2	3	4
13.	Quality of Presenters	1	2	3	4
14.	Pre-Conference Publicity	1	2	3	4
15.	Registration Process	1	2	3	4
16.	Cost of the Conference	1	2	3	4
17.	Opportunities for Networking	1	2	3	4

PART III: Overall, how would you rate the following aspects of the workshops in which you participated? (Circle your response.)

		TERRIBLE	O.K.	GOOD	OUTSTANDING
18.	Content/Subjects Covered	1	2	3	4
19.	Organization of Workshops	1	2	3	4
20.	Application of Current Issues	1	2	3	4
21.	Usefulness of Information	1	2	3	4
22.	Quality of Presenters	1	2	3	4

PART IV: How would you rate the Keynote Speakers? (Circle your response)

		TERRIBLE	O.K.	GOOD	OUTSTANDING
23.	Representative Ray Miller	1	2	3	4
24.	Cheryl Boyce	1	2	3	4

PART V: Check the appropriate responses:

25. At what level do you work:

___ COUNTY ___ DISTRICT ___ STATE

26. Your title is:

___ AGENT ___ EFNEP NUTRITION EDUCATOR ___ DISTRICT SPECIALIST
___ STATE SPECIALIST ___ ADMINISTRATOR ___ HUMAN SERVICES
___ OTHER (LIST)_____

27. Your major area of program focus is:

___ HOME ECONOMICS ___ 4-H/YOUTH DEVELOPMENT ___ EFNEP
___ AGRICULTURE ___ CNRD (COMMUNITY AND NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT)
___ SOCIAL WORK ___ OTHER (LIST) _____

28. Your gender is:

___ MALE ___ FEMALE

29. Your race/ethnic group is:

___ CAUCASIAN ___ BLACK/AFRICAN-AMERICA ___ NATIVE AMERICAN
___ HISPANIC ___ ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER ___ OTHER

Appendix C

REACHING FAMILIES AND YOUTH WHO HAVE LIMITED RESOURCES FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION

I. KNOWLEDGE

Please circle the letter(s) that best approximates your response(s) to the following questions.

1. Which of the following characteristics **are common to most** limited resource families and youth?

   a. INABILITY TO OBTAIN ADEQUATE HEALTH CARE
   b. SUBSTANCE ABUSE
   c. LOW SELF-ESTEEM
   d. SUBSTANDARD HOUSING
   e. POOR NUTRITION
   f. ARE RACIAL/ETHNIC MINORITIES
   g. LIVE EXCLUSIVELY IN URBAN COMMUNITIES
   h. LIMITED EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES
   i RECEIVE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE
   j. INADEQUATE INCOME DESPITE EMPLOYMENT

2. Which of the following **continue to be issues** facing Ohio's limited resource families and youth?

   a. HIGH LEVEL OF ILLITERACY
   b. MINORITY COMPETITION FOR LIMITED JOB OPPORTUNITIES
   c. INCREASED INCIDENCE OF CHILD ABUSE
   d. INCREASED EXPOSURE TO CRIME/VIOLENCE
   e. INADEQUATE HOUSING OPTIONS
   f. LIMITED TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS
   g. INCREASED NUMBER OF SINGLE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS

3. Which of the following **are emerging issues** (i.e., increasing in incidence and/or new dimensions) facing Ohio's limited resource families and youth?

   a. HIGH RISK OF HIV INFECTION
   b. INCREASED NUMBERS OF ENTRY-LEVEL PRODUCTION JOBS
   c. HIGH RISK OF CONTRACTING TUBERCULOSIS
   d. ABUSE OF WELFARE BENEFITS
   e. MIGRATION INTO URBAN AREAS
   f. INCREASED ACCEPTANCE OF DIVERSITY
   g. INCREASED NUMBER OF HOMELESS FAMILIES AND YOUTH

4. Which of the following agencies/organizations conduct educational programs and/or provide human services **primarily** for limited resource families and youth?

   a. DEPARTMENTS OF HUMAN SERVICES
   b. HEALTH DEPARTMENTS
   c. COUNTY LIBRARIES
   d. THE SALVATION ARMY
   e. THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

f. OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION
g. FOOD BANKS/PANTRIES
h. BOY SCOUTS
i. HABITAT FOR HUMANITY

5. Which of the following programs are targeted **primarily** for limited resource families and youth?

a. WIC (WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN)
b. 4-H
c EFNEP (EXPANDED FOOD AND NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM)
d. MEALS ON WHEELS
e. HEAD START
f. D.A.R.E. PROGRAM (Drugs and Alcohol Resistance Education)
g. GRADS PROGRAM (Graduation Reality and Dual-role Skills)
h. DISPLACED HOMEMAKERS
i. FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

6. In what types of communities do limited resource families and youth live? (Check all that apply).

a. INNER CITY
b. SUBURBIA
c. RURAL APPALACHIA
d. FARMS
e. SMALL TOWNS

II: ATTITUDES

Please place a "check mark" (✓) based on your experiences since the conference on one line between each pair of words that best describes your opinion about the following aspects of limited resource audiences.

7. Limited resource families and youth are...

GOOD	: : :	BAD
UNFRIENDLY	: : :	FRIENDLY
NEW	: : :	OLD
SHARP	: : :	DULL
DIRTY	: : :	CLEAN

8. Working with limited resource audiences is...

COMFORTABLE	: : :	UNCOMFORTABLE
DIFFICULT	: : :	EASY
USELESS	: : :	USEFUL
PURPOSEFUL	: : :	PURPOSELESS
RIGHT	: : :	WRONG

9. Collaborating with other agencies/organizations regarding limited resource families and youth...

IS EASY	___:___:___	IS HARD
MAINTAINS IDENTITY	___:___:___	LOSES IDENTITY
IS EFFECTIVE	___:___:___	NOT EFFECTIVE
IS NEGATIVE	___:___:___	IS POSITIVE
REQUIRES MUCH TIME	___:___:___	REQUIRES LITTLE TIME

III. SKILLS

Circle the number that best matches your own skill level in working with limited resource audiences in the following areas since participating in the conference.

SCALE: 1 = no skills
2 = few skills
3 = some skills
4 = many skills

10.	BUILDING SUPPORT NETWORKS	1	2	3	4
11.	COLLABORATING/WORKING TOGETHER	1	2	3	4
12.	IDENTIFYING POTENTIAL AUDIENCES	1	2	3	4
13.	ASSESSING NEEDS OF CLIENTELE	1	2	3	4
14.	DESIGNING RELEVANT PROGRAMS	1	2	3	4
15.	IMPLEMENTING RELEVANT PROGRAMS	1	2	3	4
16.	EVALUATING IMPACT OF PROGRAMS	1	2	3	4
17.	WORKING WITH DIVERSE POPULATIONS	1	2	3	4
18.	UTILIZING EVALUATION RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM	1	2	3	4

IV: ASPIRATIONS

In thinking about your work with limited resource families and youth as a result of attending this conference...

19. Please describe programs/activities/ideas that have been successful.

20. Please describe programs/activities/ideas that have not worked well.

21. Please ***check (✓) five*** of the following topics on which you would like additional training or information. Please place and asterisk (*) beside your **top choice.**

___ EMERGING ISSUES
___ STRATEGIES FOR WORKING WITH LIMITED RESOURCE FAMILIES AND YOUTH
___ WORKING WITH DIVERSE GROUPS
___ HEALTH CARE ISSUES
___ ISSUES PERTAINING TO HOMELESSNESS
___ TRANSITIONING THESE AUDIENCES INTO EXISTING EXTENSION PROGRAMS
___ DEVELOPING VOLUNTEER LEADERSHIP FOR LIMITED RESOURCE AUDIENCES
___ DEVELOPING RESOURCE MATERIALS FOR LIMITED RESOURCE AUDIENCES
___ DEVELOPING AN INTER-AGENCY NETWORK FOR SHARING IDEAS AND RESOURCES
___ OTHER (PLEASE IDENTIFY):_____

22. If you had **one choice,** how would you prefer to receive additional training/support?

___ A FACE-TO-FACE CONFERENCE/IN-SERVICE
___ AN INTERACTIVE SATELLITE CONFERENCE/IN-SERVICE
___ PRINTED MATERIALS (fact sheets, self-study packets, etc.)
___ VIDEO TAPES
___ AUDIO TAPES
___ A COMBINATION FACE-TA-FACE/SATELLITE/CONFERENCE/IN-SERVICE

V. PLEASE PROVIDE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED:

23. Last four digits of your: HOME TELEPHONE NUMBER ___
WORK TELEPHONE NUMBER ___

24. What is your work title: _____

25. Please indicate with a check (✓) the type of agency with whom you work.

___ EXTENSION ___ SCHOOLS ___ HUMAN SERVICES
___ HEALTH SERVICES ___ CHURCHES ___ SOCIAL SERVICES
___ OTHER (PLEASE LIST) _____